Tapes-missing: I have read Lardner's story and the text of Nixon's statement as in today's Post. My purpose is to ask that when you read the Times' story (or any others) dealing with the statement itself, if there is anything other than in Lardner's comment, I'd appreciate it if it interprets or analyzes. I regard this as an important statement, made for reasons thatto Nixon and his staff must be more than usually important (or, for onething, there would have been silence) and not exactly truthful. In my mind, without checking the carbons, I have compared this with my analyses/presumptions as in my letters to Sussman and find nothing to contradict leave alone refute what I then thought was obvious and much to confirm it. The existence of separate recorders for the phones, for example. Indications if not proof that there were separate recorders for buildings if not parts of them. There is also indication that Nixon personally saw tothe disappearance of what no longer exists. His comment on his Sunday meeting with Dean makes it hard to believe he did not see to it that there would be a tape, on the system or made in the office. The significance of the meeting was such that he'd not have failed to dictate a memo if he was in the habit and would have dependedupon the slower hand-written notes (the time they were written depends entirely on his word). See Dean's memo of his call to Higby on this, before the meeting). The reference to Kleindienst's presence and the tape running out there points to the significance of the meeting with Kleindienst, to which Kl testified before the Ervin committee. What is so conspicuously lacking in this "offer" is an offer to make available the tape including the playing back of a tape, requested and refused in court...That Nixon was impelled to make this offer, regardless of how little or how much it may mean, is indicative of his feeling intense pressure or as much fear. Or both. However, offering the court what has not been sought does not replace what has disappeared. HW 11/13/73